

II. RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION

A. Status of the Claims

Claims 1-90, a total of 90 claims were pending at the time of the Action.

Applicants have canceled claims 1-53 (53 claims), 55-82 (28 claims), and 86-90 (5 claims), without prejudice or disclaimer in the Amendment submitted herewith. Therefore, Applicants have cancelled a total of 86 claims.

Claims 54 and 83-85 were deemed allowable in the Office Action mailed September 1, 2004. Action at page 14. Consequently, claims 176-260 have been added as dependent claims from these allowable claims. Therefore, Applicants have added a total of 85 dependent claims in the Amendment, which is one claim less than the number of canceled claims.

New dependent claims 176-260 are allowable, because the claims from which they depend were found allowable in the Action.

The entry of new claims 176-260 does not result in the entry of new matter into the case. The new claims correspond to the canceled claims, and thus, the subject matter of the new claims has already been examined. With the exception of claims 180 and 222, all of claims 176-260 essentially correspond to previously rejected dependent claims. Further, claims 180 and 222, while not having a precise counterpart in the previously dependent claims, merely incorporate limitations from two previous dependent claims into a single dependent claim. The table indicates the support for claims 176-260 in the previously depending claims.

Furthermore, the addition of new dependent claims 176-260 cannot present prior art or other issues. The subject matter of claims 176-260 was previously examined in the context of now cancelled dependent claims 3-19, 21, 23, 25, 27-40, 42, 46, 48, 53, and 86-90, as set forth in the table below, and any rejections to the subject matter of these claims have been overcome by the fact that that subject matter now depends from claims found allowable in the Action. The only art rejections to the subject matter of previous claims 3-19, 21, 23, 25, 27-40, 42, 46, 48, 53,

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

and 86-90 were based upon their dependence from rejected base claims. The only other rejections to the subject matter of previous claims 3-19, 21, 23, 25, 27-40, 42, 46, 48, 53, and 86-90 were based on 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, because they were dependent from claim 1, which was held to have an indefiniteness defect. Because claims 176-260 depend from claims found to be allowable in the Action, the subject matter of those claims cannot be subject to rejection over any issues of prior art or 35 U.S.C. § 112.

| Added Claim(s) | Former Claim |
|----------------|--------------|
| 176 and 213 | 3 |
| 177 and 219 | 4 |
| 178 and 220 | 5 |
| 179 and 221 | 6 |
| 180 and 222 | 5 and 6 |
| 181 and 223 | 7 |
| 182 and 224 | 8 |
| 183 and 225 | 9 |
| 184 and 226 | 10 |
| 185 and 227 | 11 |
| 228 | 12 |
| 229 | 13 |
| 186 and 230 | 14 |
| 187 and 231 | 15 |
| 188 and 232 | 16 |
| 189 and 233 | 17 |
| 190 and 234 | 18 |
| 191 and 235 | 19 |
| 192 and 236 | 21 |
| 193 and 237 | 23 |
| 194 and 238 | 25 |
| 195 and 239 | 27 |

| Added Claim(s) | Former Claim |
|----------------|--------------|
| 196 and 240 | 28 |
| 197 and 241 | 29 |
| 198 and 242 | 30 |
| 199 and 243 | 31 |
| 200 and 244 | 32 |
| 201 and 245 | 33 |
| 202 and 246 | 34 |
| 203 and 247 | 35 |
| 204 and 248 | 36 |
| 205 and 249 | 37 |
| 206 and 250 | 38 |
| 207 and 251 | 39 |
| 208 and 252 | 40 |
| 209 and 253 | 42 |
| 210 and 254 | 46 |
| 211 | 48 |
| 212 and 255 | 53 |
| 213 and 256 | 86 |
| 214 and 257 | 87 |
| 215 and 258 | 88 |
| 216 and 259 | 89 |
| 217 and 260 | 90 |

In view of the above, claims 54, 83-85, and 176-260 will be pending upon entry of this Amendment.

B. Incorporation by Reference

The specification has been objected to for improper incorporation by reference. This rejection is based on the paragraph at page 80, lines 2-4, of the specification. Applicants have deleted the paragraph at page 80, lines 2-4, of the specification in the Amendment submitted

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

herewith. Therefore, this rejection is moot. Applicants would note that specific incorporations by reference do occur in the specification, but that no rejections have been made based upon that text.

In view of the above, Applicants request withdrawal of this rejection.

C. Amendment to Specification

The specification has been amended to eliminate a hyperlink and replace it with comparable language.

CONCLUSION

Applicants believe that the foregoing remarks fully respond to all outstanding matters for this application. Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of all claims be withdrawn because they are in condition for allowance. At the very least, Applicants request entry of these amendments in order to place the case in better form for an appeal.

Should the Examiner desire to sustain any of the rejections discussed in relation to this Response, the courtesy of a telephonic conference between the Examiner, the Examiner's supervisor, and the undersigned attorney at 512-536-3035 is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Gina N. Shishima
Reg. No. 45,104
Attorney for Applicants

FULBRIGHT & JAWORSKI L.L.P.
600 Congress Avenue, Suite 2400
Austin, Texas 78701
(512) 474-5201
(512) 536-4598 (facsimile)

Date: February 18, 2005